

1964

22011

provisions of the National Defense Education Act.

Later in this report, I will discuss some other education legislation sponsored by one of the House committees on which I serve, the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

NUCLEAR TEST BAN TREATY

The Senate ratified the limited nuclear test ban treaty in 1963, a decision, it should be noted, which we in the House could have no part in since the Constitution puts treaty matters solely in Senate hands. Many nations have since signed the treaty, which bars nuclear testing in the atmosphere, outer space, and underwater, but it should be pointed out that Red China, Cuba, and France continue to be holdouts to signing.

FOREIGN AID

Appropriations for our vast foreign-aid program for the 1965 fiscal year are still in doubt at this writing. Last year, we managed to cut back the President's original request from \$4.9 to \$3.6 billion, though I still could not find it possible to support this legislation in view of guaranteed credit provisions available to the Soviet bloc nations for the purchase of U.S. wheat. Incidentally, we now know Castro has been getting some of this wheat.

This year's aid request has been billed "bare bones" in the way of budgets, and asks for \$3.25 billion, including \$125 million to build up the Vietnamese military.

SOCIAL SECURITY

Another bill still in doubt—though we passed it easily in the House—is the measure raising social security benefits across-the-board by 5 percent. The controversy over medicare provisions written into the bill by the Senate has delayed its passage so far.

FOOD STAMP PLAN

Under this program, eligible families get \$10 worth of food stamps for \$6 in cash. The plan is expected to cost \$25 million the first year, \$75 million the next, \$100 million the third year, and \$200 million in the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967.

LEGISLATIVE REAPPORTIONMENT

My bill on reapportionment—and there are many similar ones—proposes an amendment to our Federal Constitution specifying the right of States to apportion at least one house in their legislatures on a basis other than population. At the moment, leaders in the Senate are attempting to provide for a delay in the effect of the Supreme Court ruling which requires that both houses of State legislatures be apportioned solely on the basis of population. Differing ideas about reapportionment is one of the major reasons adjournment of this Congress is delayed.

BILLS FROM MY COMMITTEE

I am especially proud of congressional actions directed to the health of our people, which had their beginnings in my committee.

Last year, my Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee recommended the authorization of a 3-year program of matching grants to expand teaching and

research facilities of medical, dental, and related-type colleges. These provisions, plus a system of student loans, should help eliminate the pressing lack of qualified doctors and dentists.

My committee also developed legislation to establish mental health and mental retardation centers throughout the Nation, in cooperation with State and local agencies.

Of course, one of the bills I feel will be of great importance in solving the problem of a critical lack of bedside nurses in the Nurses Training Act of 1964, also a bill from my committee. My committee amendments, which were accepted, provide for student loans patterned after the National Defense Education Act, and will enable many more young women of modest means to enroll in hospital nursing training programs.

OTHER BILLS STILL PENDING

In addition to reapportionment and foreign aid, other major bills still in the works include the controversial Appalachia bill, which would cost \$1 billion to get started. A part of the administration's overall "poverty package" in this election year, the bill is supposed to assist 355 counties in 11 States with welfare and unemployment problems. Over \$1 million per year would be needed just to pay administrative costs needed to organize the program.

In view of all the other spending ideas which have been enacted in this Congress, this bill will not have my support if it comes up.

The Area Redevelopment Administration also wants to expand its activities by \$355 million, but is getting an unsympathetic ear from many of us.

Even the Government itself—through the General Accounting Office—has accused the ARA of illegally spending \$7.4 million on questionable projects in several States where no depressed areas existed. This raises the question, naturally, whether politics or need has been the criterion in the distribution of taxpayer funds under this program.

MINNESOTA RIVER BASIN, OTHER SECOND DISTRICT ASSISTS

After appearing before the House Appropriations Committee, it was gratifying to be able to obtain \$50,000 from Congress for the start of a survey of the Minnesota River Valley Basin. It is the hope of all that sound and wise development will prove feasible as a result of the study, since this great region affects half the population of Minnesota and practically all the Second Congressional District. The survey will consider many factors—flood control, development for industrial and recreation uses, wildlife protection, and water pollution controls.

Following passage of the Library Services Act last year, I requested the authorization of Mankato State College as an official Government depository library. Gustavus Adolphus College in St. Peter also bears such a designation and with two such depository libraries Government documents will be more accessible to residents of the Second Congressional District.

We were also able to be helpful to the

cities of Mankato, Fairmont, and Worthington in restoring, at least for a time, twice-daily plane service to those cities. Continued service will depend on the Civil Aeronautics Board's "use it or lose it" policy.

These then, constitute a few of the significant items acted on in this Congress. In representing the people of the Second District and in casting my votes, I have tried always to be guided by beliefs which are vital to a strong and prosperous America, and by the principles and convictions expressed to me by the overwhelming majority of the citizens of the Second District.

SHOULD THE UNITED STATES RECOGNIZE A CUBAN GOVERNMENT-IN-EXILE?

(Mr. CRAMER (at the request of Mr. TUPPER) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, in the October issue of the American Legion magazine, the question of whether the United States should recognize a Cuban Government-in-exile is discussed.

I take the affirmative side of this question; our distinguished colleague, Senator PHILIP A. HART, of Michigan, takes the negative.

Believing the contents of this discussion to be of interest, I am inserting the article in the RECORD at this point:

SHOULD THE UNITED STATES RECOGNIZE A CUBAN GOVERNMENT-IN-EXILE?

YES

(By Representative WILLIAM C. CRAMER, Republican, of Florida, 12th District)

One obvious step to rid the Americas of communism is the recognition of a free, non-Communist Cuban Government-in-exile.

Historically and traditionally, the United States has recognized many free governments-in-exile—and still does. Today, for example, we continue to recognize the exiled Governments of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania despite the fact that these European countries are republics of the Soviet Union.

Conditions necessitating the recognition of governments-in-exile in other countries exist in Cuba today—an alien government occupying a previously recognized free country.

Once a Cuban Government-in-exile is recognized, it can legally receive our assistance as well as the assistance of other hemispheric nations. It would fall under the provisions of the treaties of Rio and Caracas. It could become a member of the Organization of American States.

A government-in-exile could, as well, accomplish these objectives: (a) Provide a rallying force for all Cuban refugees; (b) give encouragement and help to the Cuban underground; (c) give courage and hope to the oppressed anti-Castro Cubans who are in the majority in Cuba; (d) provide the means for Cubans to win back their own freedom.

A recent report of the Senate's Subcommittee To Investigate Problems Connected With Refugees and Escapees, said: "Castro and communism must be expelled from Cuba. They will be buried the deepest, if buried by Cubans—on the island and in exile."

The exile community cannot help accomplish this objective unless it wins the support of the entire free world. The United States must take the leadership by recognizing a

free Cuban Government-in-exile, thus encouraging the OAS to follow suit.

Until recently, the strongest argument against recognizing a Cuban Government-in-exile was the supposed difficulty of knowing which exile group to recognize. The exile community itself has answered this argument. Recently, a group named the Comité Pro-Referendum was able to locate 75,103 Cubans in exile throughout the world who, by reason of age and other normal standards, qualified as voters. All were mailed ballots on which they could vote for or against a panel of five widely respected, nonpolitical Cuban exiles to represent the exile community.

Votes cast in favor of the panel numbered 40,905. Opposed, 979. Thus, 98 percent of the votes cast were in support of this group, an accomplishment which clearly dispelled the belief that Cubans cannot get together politically.

Many claim that recognizing governments-in-exile has been a historically unsuccessful way to free captive nations. Maybe this is true. But Cuba, unlike the enslaved European countries, is an island of slavery in a hemisphere of free nations. As such, it cannot stand if we take clearly needed steps, one of which is recognition of a free Cuban Government-in-exile.

NO

(By Senator PHILIP A. HART, Democrat, of Michigan)

A recent report by the Senate Subcommittee on Refugees "encourages efforts toward finding a broad formula for unity among Cuban exile organizations. . . . A broadly based exile organization could authoritatively address governments, international bodies, and public opinion in the cause of Cuban freedom."

The report calls "inadvisable," however, a Government-in-exile. The subcommittee's view is heavily weighted on the side of logic and prudence.

One of the principal reasons is the historical experience which suggests clearly that governments-in-exile offer little substance in efforts to regain a lost country. Such governments tend to lose touch with the people inside the country. Yet, in the case of Cuba, expertly organized internal resistance will be an important element in securing the island's freedom. Few Americans or Cuban exiles advocate outright invasion.

Responsible exile leaders who command loyalties within Cuba, logically should assist the internal resistance. As the subcommittee report states, the leaders' ties with Cuba "should be encouraged and strengthened in order to maintain and broaden the fire of disaffection and eventual revolt."

A popular anti-Castro movement, or defection in the armed forces or government, could well develop into an organized political alternative to the Castro regime. It is conceivable that freedom fighters could secure control of a piece of territory, establish a provisional government, and ask for recognition and assistance. The United States—and the Organization of American States—should be free to take advantage of such developments, and to respond favorably to requests for assistance if other conditions warrant it. A recognized government in exile, however, would tie our hands. It is improbable that an exile government would have strong connections with a revolutionary provisional government on Cuban soil.

There are other reasons against recognizing a government in exile. Most observers, including exile leaders, agree it would be difficult to find a stable coalition which could unite the majority of exiles behind it. Too many competing elements exist. Moreover, any selection made inevitably would be labeled a puppet government.

And our ability to work with those left out would be severely limited, causing many

secondary problems to detract from the main issue of Cuba's freedom.

On the legal side, a most important factor to consider is that U.S. recognition of an exile government would free Castro of Cuba's obligations under the Guantanamo Treaty. The United States should not make it easier for Castro to dodge his treaty obligations through direct action or in the United Nations. But that is precisely the effect our recognition of a government in exile would have.

Cuba's freedom is important to the security and development of the Western Hemisphere. But it is doubtful that a recognized government in exile would lend much support to the variety of efforts needed in pursuing this objective.

(Mr. GRABOWSKI (at the request of Mr. ASHMORE) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

(Mr. GRABOWSKI'S remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.)

J. FRANK DOBIE

(Mr. GONZALEZ (at the request of Mr. ASHMORE) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, last Friday, September 18, 1964, J. Frank Dobie died. He was a great and wonderful man. As John Ciardi, the poet and author, said in an article for the Saturday Review in 1962, he was a *hombre*. That he was, *muy hombre*.

He knew more about Texas folklore than any man of his time, and he was the leading authority on the culture of the Southwest. He probably did more to bring southwestern culture to the Nation and the world, to open it for further study by others, and to help it flower, than any other individual.

He was born on a ranch in Live Oak County, Tex., September 28, 1888, where he lived until he was 16 years old. He went to high school in Alice, Tex., and then attended Southwestern University in Georgetown, Tex., where he received a B.A. degree in 1910. He also studied one summer at the University of Chicago while an undergraduate. In 1910 he was appointed principal of the grade school in Alpine, Tex., and 1 year later returned to Southwestern University to teach English.

He had worked as a reporter for the San Antonio Express during the summer of 1910, and put in another summer as a reporter in 1914 for the Galveston Tribune.

In 1914 he received his M.A. at Columbia University and joined the faculty at the University of Texas the same year. He was contemptuous of the doctoral degree, saying that obtaining one was "simply transferring the bones from one graveyard to the next." In fact, throughout his life he was a maverick, an individual who refused to be branded with values which he could not accept.

During World War I he served as a first lieutenant in the 116th Field Artillery. Upon his return from France in 1919 he resumed his teaching career at

U.T. But after a year he left academic life to manage a 250,000-acre ranch on the Nueces River, where he developed his idea to collect and retell the legends and folk tales of Texas. He went on to write more than 30 books of what will most likely be classified as "folklore." Yet, he did not consider himself a folklorist. Nor, by his own admission, was he a scientific historian. In describing himself he once stated: "I present chronicles of what it was like in past years."

In 1921 Dobie returned to the University of Texas to teach English for 2 years. At the end of that time he was named head of the English department at Oklahoma A. & M. College, a post he held until 1925 when he returned to the University of Texas as adjunct professor of English. In 1933 he became the first native Texan to receive a full professorship in the university's English department. He received research grants from the Laura Spelman Rockefeller Foundation in 1930-31 and 1934-35. In 1932-33, with the aid of a grant from the Guggenheim Memorial Foundation, he traveled 2,000 miles on muleback gathering folklore and material for his work.

The classes he taught were perennial favorites with the students and unique in that he often strayed from the safe boundaries of academics to discuss controversial subjects. These discussions ranged from political personalities to the race question. He called himself the outlaw of the campus. In a university dependent upon a rural dominated State legislature for its operating funds, headed by a politically appointed board of regents, such behavior was not likely to win approval.

Eventually he took on the board of regents in open combat. In 1943 three university teachers were fired for their activities outside the school. Dobie joined a faculty and student group to petition for their immediate reinstatement.

The president of the university, Dr. Homer P. Rainey, joined Dobie and the others in charging the regents with the suppression of academic freedom. The regents prevailed and Dr. Rainey himself was forced to leave the university. As a result of the incident the school was placed on probation in 1945 by the Southern Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools. Also in 1943, the Manford Act, strictly regulating unions and the licensing of organizers, became law in Texas. Dobie had this to say:

A man can come to Texas and without interference invite all the people he wants to join the Republican Party, the Liars' Club, the Association for the Appointment of Herbert Hoover as Prophet, almost any kind of organization except one. If the Manford law is an index of capitalism's future policy, the people had better begin digging cellars for the revolution.

In other words, Dobie did not retreat to an ivory tower and divorce himself from the social problems of his fellow man. He was an important person in the academic world who dared to involve himself in politics and to involve himself with people. These was a movement to urge him to run for Governor in 1944,